

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS****1. Election/Restrictions**

During a telephone conversation with the Examiner on July 2, 2004, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group 1, pertaining to Claims 1 – 3. Claims 4 – 7 are hereby withdrawn from further consideration. The Applicant hereby affirms this election to prosecute Claims 1 – 3.

**2. Priority**

10 In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the application is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.63(c) since the oath does not acknowledge the filing of any foreign application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out this error, and hereby submits a corrected oath which properly indicates the prior foreign filing.

**15 3. Claim Objections**

The Examiner additionally objected to Claim 2 because of a typographical error wherein the word “golf” was misspelled “gold.” The Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the error and submits an amended Claim 2 to correct the error.

**20 4. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112**

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, stating that the limitation “the orientation angle” in line 1 has an insufficient antecedent basis.

25 The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion. The term “the orientation angle,” as referred to in Claim 3, has a general, inherent meaning in the context of an angle at which any object is oriented with another object. In Claim 3, the term “the orientation angle” refers to the angle at which the reinforced fiber of the joint material intersects a joint border line in said joining section. Therefore, Applicant believes that the phrase “the orientation angle” has a sufficient antecedent basis, and requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

**5. Claim rejections under 35 USC 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 3 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by a patent to Yoneyama (US Patent No. 4,635,941, hereinafter “Yoneyama”) and a patent to Vincent (US Patent No. 5,405,137, hereinafter “Vincent”).

5 The Applicant has reviewed the rejections of Claims 1 – 3, but respectfully disagrees for the reasons set forth below.

*Claim 1*

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Yoneyama discloses a golf club head comprised of a head main body to be integrated with a golf shaft and a surface material to be integrated with the head main body, wherein a groove is provided in at least part of a joining section between the head main body and surface material and the joint material composed of fiber-reinforced resin material being embedded in the groove (referring to Figures 3 and 4 of Yoneyama).

15 The Examiner further stated that Vincent discloses a golf club head comprised of a head main body 1 to be integrated with a golf shaft and a surface material 2 to be integrated with the head main body, wherein a groove 4 is provided in at least part of a joining section between the head main body and surface material and the joint material composed of fiber-reinforced resin material being embedded in the groove (referring to

20 Column 4, lines 48 – 51 and Figures 1 – 3)

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion by the Examiner that Yoneyama teaches Claim 1 of the present invention. Yoneyama appears to teach the use of teeth-like indentations on the head main body which act as receptacles for similarly-shaped protruding protuberances on the surface material, such that the protuberances 25 exactly fit into the grooves. However, the present invention discloses the use of a groove which does not have an identical shape to the joining section of the surface material. The present invention provides for a substantial portion of the groove to be filled with the fiber-reinforced resin material. To describe it differently, Yoneyama teaches the use of grooves which function to receive teeth-like protruding segments that structurally support 30 the joint between the head main body and the surface material. In contrast, the present

invention provides for a groove which is shaped to receive a substantial amount of fiber-reinforced resin, not a corresponding protruding segment to fit into the groove.

With regard to Vincent, while the present invention specifically discloses the use of a groove, Vincent only discloses a “recess” that encloses the entire portion of the 5 surface material. The “recess” of Vincent is different than the groove of the present invention in that the recess connects the entire surface of the surface material with a fiber-reinforced resin, while the present invention claims a groove that connects only a small portion of surface material to the head main body with a fiber-reinforced resin joining only this small surface.

10        In addition, neither Yoneyama nor Vincent disclose or suggest the joint section of the present invention (illustrated as 13 and 39 in Figs. 3, 8, 9, 13, and 14 of the present invention). To more accurately describe the present invention, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to further read that the groove “is constructed across a joint border line 15 in the joining section.” Applicant is not introducing new matter. Sufficient support for this amendment resides in the specification on page 15, line 3, which reads “the joint material is constructed across the joint border line.” Applicant therefore believes that the amendment more clearly indicates that the golf club head of the present invention consists of the head main body 10A (11), the surface material 10B (12), and the joining section 13 (39). The distinguishing feature of the present invention, that the joining 20 section 13 (39) is constructed across the joint border line, is now more apparent (see Fig. 14(d)).

25        In view of the above comments and the amendment to Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in allowable condition, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1.

25

#### *Claim 2*

30        In rejecting Claim 2, the Examiner stated that Yoneyama shows the groove formed so as to spread (in the sectional view thereof) toward the outer surface of the golf club head (referring to Figure 4 of Yoneyama). The Examiner further stated that Vincent discloses the groove formed so as to spread in the sectional view thereof toward the outer surface of the golf club (referring to Figures 1 and 3).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2. Specifically, Yoneyama teaches only the use of a groove on an inner head member shaped to receive a corresponding shape on an outer head member, not a groove shaped to spread toward the outer surface of the golf club head. The present invention provides 5 for a groove shaped to spread toward the outer surface of the golf club head to receive a portion of resin material. This groove then forms a bond between a joining surface material and the golf club head after a fiber-reinforced resin is deposited in the volume of the groove. In contrast, Yoneyama teaches a groove on a golf club head which receives a corresponding shape from an outer head member.

10 As mentioned in the comments regarding Claim 1, above (see page 6, lines 3 – 9), Vincent discloses a recess, but not a groove. Additionally, Figures 1 and 3 of Vincent do not even represent the recess formed so as to spread toward the outer surface of the golf club; instead, the recess presented has flat walls that remain narrow and perpendicular to the outer surface of the golf club head.

15 Furthermore, in view of the amendment to Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 2 should be withdrawn, as Claim 2 incorporates all the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

*Claim 3*

20 The Examiner also rejected Claim 3 by stating that Yoneyama shows the orientation angle of the reinforced fiber of the joint material intersecting a joint border line in the joining section (referring to Figure 4 of Yoneyama). The Examiner further stated that Vincent discloses the orientation angle of the reinforced fiber of the joint material intersecting a joint border line in the joining section (referring to Figures 1 – 3).

25 The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Neither Yoneyama nor Vincent appear to disclose any angle of reinforced fiber of the joint material intersecting with any joint border line in the joining section, as is specifically disclosed in Figure 4 of the present invention. As disclosed on page 10 of the present application, lines 14 – 19, "... a groove 18 is provided entirely over a joint border line 25 which is a center line of the border 30 between both the parts exposed on the outer surface of the golf club head 1 at the time of the joining such that it is spread toward the outer surface and the aforementioned groove

18 is filled with joint material which is made of fiber-reinforced resin material.” The Applicant is unable to find any such description in Yoneyama or Vincent referring to an orientation angle of the reinforced fiber of the joint material that intersects a joint border line in the joining section. Furthermore, neither Yoneyama nor Vincent suggest anything 5 about the “orientation angle of the reinforced fiber.”

Furthermore, in view of the amendment to Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 3 should be withdrawn, as Claim 3 incorporates all the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, the Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 3 be withdrawn.

**Concluding Remarks:**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all now pending claims 1-3 are in allowable condition. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Accordingly, early allowance and issuance of this application is respectfully requested. Should the 5 Examiner have any questions regarding this response or need any additional information, please contact the undersigned at (310) 589-8158.


The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 50-2691. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as 10 including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 50-2691.

15

Respectfully submitted,

20

12/8/2004  
Date

  
Cary Tope-McKay  
Registration No. 41,350

25 Cary Tope-McKay  
TOPE-MCKAY & ASSOCIATES  
23852 Pacific Coast Hwy. #311  
Malibu, Ca 90265  
Tel: 310.589.8158  
30 Mobile: 310.383.7468  
Fax: 310-943-2736  
E-mail: [cmckay@topemckay.com](mailto:cmckay@topemckay.com)

35